DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 527 RC 009 490

AUTHOR Miller, Michael K.; Crader, Kelly W.
TITLE Rural-Urban Differences in Community Satisfaction: Real and Relatively Important.
PUB DATE 26 Aug 76
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (New York, New York, August 26-29, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Age; Analysis of Covariance; *Community Benefits; *Economic Factors; Factor Analysis; Family Structure; Income; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Need Gratification; Research Criteria; *Rural Urban Differences; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Community Satisfaction; *Utah

ABSTRACT

Using interview data collected from 595 subjects living in 5 Utah counties, 2 dimensions of community satisfaction (economic and interpersonal) were identified via factor analysis. Employing a theoretical framework of rural-urban differences, the impact of residence on the two dimensions of satisfaction was tested by regression analysis and found to be considerable. The level of economic satisfaction was highest for urban residents and lowest for rural residents. The satisfaction level of the rural-urban split sample fell between the two extremes. Residence also differentiated interpersonal satisfaction. However, on this dimension the relative rankings were reversed. Again the satisfaction level of rural-urban split residents fell between the two extremes. Employing techniques of analysis of covariance and multiple-partial correlation, the impact of residence on community satisfaction was maintained when controlling for personal characteristics (age, income, education, family size, and tenure in the community). In view of the findings, it was suggested that "rurality" as a behavioral trait should assume much greater importance and be viewed in conjunction with structural measures, and greater attention should be directed toward residence of origin in conjunction with present residence. (Author/JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129527

OCT 1976
ERIC / CRESS
RECEIVED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Rural-Urban Differences in Community Satisfaction: Real and Relatively Important

Michael K. Miller

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Blacksburg, Virginia

Kelly W. Crader

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Blacksburg, Virginia

RC009490

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, New York, New York, 26-29 August 1976.

Rural-Urban Differences in Community Satisfaction: Real and Relatively Important[1]

Michael K. Miller and Kelly W. Crader

Department of Sociology

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Blacksburg, Virginia

ABSTRACT

Using interview data collected from 595 subjects living in five counties in Utah, two dimensions of community satisfaction (economic and interpersonal) are identified through the use of factor analysis. Employing a theoretical framework of rural-urban differences, the impact of residence on the two dimensions of satisfaction is tested by regression analysis and found to be considerable. The level of economic satisfaction was highest for urban residents and lowest for rural residents. The satisfaction level of the rural-urban split sample fell between the two extremes. Residence also differentiated interpersonal satisfaction. However, on this dimension the relative rankings reversed. Again the satisfaction level of rural-urban split residents fell between the two extremes. Employing techniques of analysis of covariance and multiple-partial correlation the impact of residence on community satisfaction was maintained when controlling for personal characteristics.

---

[1]Research reported in this paper was supported by the Utah State University Agricultural Experiment Station, Project 819.

Rural-Urban Differences in Community Satisfaction:
Real and Relatively Important

Early conceptual schemes by such grand masters as Durkheim, mechanic-organic; Main, status-contract; and Tonnies, gemeinschaft-gessellschaft, have been most influential in more contemporary debates concerning the viability of the construct "Rural" or "Rurality". While the issue was hotly contested at one point, e.g., Bealer, et al. (1965); Dewey (1960); Duncan (1961); Fuguitt (1963); Miner (1952); Pahl (1966); Schnore (1966); Sorokin and Zimmerman (1929); Stewart (1958); Willits, et al. (1963), notions of a "Mass Society" or the pre-eminence of concern with "Urban Dominance" have seemingly replaced many of the earlier debates. As a result, efforts directed toward extracting direct social effects of residence continue but have nonetheless declined with time. The decline continues in spite of developments in conceptual and methodological sophistication, innovative analytic approaches, and efforts to systematically review and synthesize various facets of rural-urban differentiation. The issue of rurality as a dimension space deserves additional consideration (Bealer, 1975). This research is directed toward that end. Specifically, the study is designed to extract empirical dimensions of community satisfaction, subsequently rural-urban differences in the extracted dimensions are examined.

A controversy is everywhere apparent in conceptual definitions of "rurality," or conversely "urbanity." The issue is wide ranging and includes the viability of a rural-urban continuum, the question of "rurality" as an individual and/or system concept, and challenges to the utility of multitudinous terms associated, by fiat, with rurality. A brief synopsis is in order. Duncan (1961) finds a rural-urban continuum

to exist in some but relatively few respects; Bealer (1966) espouses an additional definition in terms of the individual. Dewey (1960) notes that the terminologies juxtaposed upon the concept of rurality, while voluminous, indicate little consensus. In fact, if only the five terms judged to most appropriately characterize rurality (anonymity, division of labor, heterogenity, impersonality, symbols of status) are employed (Dewey, 1960), it may be argued that the conceptual definition is still too encompassing. For instance, is anonymity a part or consequence of urbanity?

On the empirical, and perhaps more innovative, side is Lowe and Peak's (1974) definition of the rural-urban variable in terms of both location and life style. Theirs is a unique perspective and has the possible advantage of bridging the gap between locations which are strictly rural or, conversely, strictly urban in terms of location. This perspective would also allow for conceptual definition of rurality as a behavior trait (Bealer, 1966). As such, the difficulties encountered by suburban areas could feasibly be circumvented. On the other hand, Lowe and Peak (1974) acknowledge that life style is to some extent a cultural phenomena. In that case, the life style component of a ubiquitous rural-urban variable must of necessity be integral to all possible subcultures to allow for possible comparison across those subcultures. The likelihood of isolating a variable of such ubiquitous nature is questionable when continued differentiation and current complexity of modern socio-cultural systems is considered. This is not to negate the findings of Lowe and Peak utilizing alcoholic abstinence as the life style component of rural-urban variation. More simply, it should be noted that numerous beer cans can be located along the by-ways of rural America.

What is the solution to the problem? A single solution, no doubt, does not exist. The present effort takes the position that parsimony and perhaps a step "backward" are in order. As such, the present definition of rurality is simply place of residence designated in terms of census classification. Such a definition implies the importance of the degree of agricultural dominance within a geographic area. With this basic definition the central issue is to what extent are current rural-urban variations salient predictors of social phenomena? Certainly, much has been made of the decline in differences between rural and urban residence (Fuguitt, 1963). Also, it has been noted that differences that do remain are relatively unimportant (Dewey, 1960). On the other hand, recent research by Rojek, et al. (1975), indicate major differences in community service satisfaction which can be attributed to residential location. More specifically, although residence failed to predict satisfaction with public service or education, residence was found to differentiate satisfaction with both medical and commercial satisfaction. Such differentials were generally maintained when multiple socio-economic variables were controlled. This is not to say that socio-economic influences are nonexistent, a point which is apparent in their work but little discussed by Rojek, et al.(1975); such influences do not, however, negate the effects of rural-urban residential location.

The tack taken by Rojek, et al., (1975) is that of a social indicators approach which espouses subjective assessment in relation to objective conditions. This perspective necessarily entails that the focus of assessment be of a tangible nature--for both subjective reference and identification of objective conditions. As such, the Rojek, et al., (1975) argument to confine

their study to satisfaction with community services is well taken. Not so easy to accept, however, is that Rojek, et al., (1975) failed to specify the objective service conditions so requisite to their approach to social indicators. Rather, it was apparently assumed that city-small town-open country residence necessarily indicated objective service conditions. The result is that of a typical rural-urban differences study but with community satisfaction needlessly limited to services. This is not to say the Rojek, et al., (1975) investigation is of little value or unwarranted. Their justification is, however, unwarranted in view of the logical basis for their study design.

The likelihood of either masking or accentuating viable differentials by means of premature concentration upon a limited social dimension may be surmised from the study by Andrews and Withey (1974). Their effort was, in part, an attempt to isolate perceptual structures about life concerns in general. They define "concerns" to consist of domains and criteria. The first is that of substance, e.g., family and friends; the second are values by which domains may be evaluated. The perceptual map of concerns clearly indicates services, viewed broadly, to be of importance but only as part of a much larger whole. In fact, concerns about self, family, and friends were most central and factors around which other concerns were organized. Certainly, the fact of service availability is or may be a subset of concerns about family and friends; concentration on services alone, however, could obscure the most critical dimension. Given the work by Andrews and Withey (1974), a study of rural-urban differences in community satisfaction would call for, at a minimum, the possibility of empirical dimensions beyond those of service satisfaction. It is to this task that the present investigation is directed.

The above noted findings of Andrews and Withey (1974), with regard to perceptual structures were based upon national samples. It is expected that any dimensional analysis of substantive issues of concern would approximate their results. More specifically, a dimensional analysis of satisfaction items would most likely result in finding substantive issues about self, family, and friends to be critical. This is not to say that other issues would not be of some importance. The relative emphasis on strictly personal or interpersonal issues should, however, be equal to or greater than those such as community services. Further, given the apparently diffuse nature of services in perceptual structures noted by Andrews and Withey, it is also likely that dimensions other than those of an interpersonal nature will emerge as more important than that of services.

The general expectations may thus be reiterated. Dimensional analysis of satisfaction issues will:

a. locate priority within interpersonal rather than service concerns;

b. relegate service concerns to be of only minor importance.

Empirical Dimensions of Satisfaction

As alluded to above, the concept of community satisfaction is theoretically multidimensional. Metric theory assumes that observed values on a series of empirical indicators can be used to position an entity or social fact on one or more of the underlying dimensions (Heise, 1974). The assumption is tangible since values on the underlying dimensions determine, at least in part, values on the indicator variables. Further, as Heise (1974) points out, the relation between the indicators and the underlying dimensions can be cumulative, nonmonotonic, or linear. The nature of the specific measurement model

dictates the type of analysis that is appropriate. The assumption of the current research is that of a linear model. In other words, it is assumed the changes along the underlying dimensions, i.e., from high to low community satisfaction, result in an increase or decrease of the expected value of the empirical indicator. "Indicators that are linearly dependent on an unmeasured variable are most appropriately analyzed by factor analysis" (Heise, 1974:5).

Specifically, the intent is to define indirectly a latent variable, community satisfaction, from the correlations among empirical indicators.[2] Subsequently, a scale (or scales) corresponding to the dimensions of satisfaction will be constructed. The weights or factor loadings assigned via a principle component extraction procedure allow for selection of germane indicators necessary for construction of reliable composite scales. The values on those scales will then covary with values of the underlying variable. To facilitate interpretation, the factors are extracted and rotated to simple structure. Following the lead of Armor (1974), only those indicators which load highest (.5 or above) on the extracted factors will be employed in the construction of the composite scales.

As can be seen from the data in Table 1, two primary factors were extracted. In combination the two factors accounted for approximately 46 per cent of the variance among all the variables in the matrix (i.e., $\frac{\Sigma h^2}{m} \times 100 = 46$). The first factor explained approximately 26 per cent and the second factor approximately 20 per cent. The communalities ranged from a low of 19 per cent (health) to a high of 50 per cent (housing).

Rotation of the two factors to simple structure via a varimax procedure resulted in loadings that defined two distinct subdimensions of satisfaction.[3] As suggested from the work of Andrew and Withey (1974), the first factor denotes an interpersonal subdimension. Variables that load .5 or above (cleanly) on this factor include ratings of the community with respect to family (.70), friends (.76), and religion (.69). On the basis of the above three loadings the first factor is named Interpersonal Satisfaction. Turning to the second factor it can be seen that evaluation of jobs (.71), income (.70) and housing (.76) all load above the acceptable criterion of .5. The nature of the variables suggest that it is an economic satisfaction dimension that is being tapped.

Table 1 about here

One further word concerning the loadings is in order. Consistent with the findings of Rojek, et al., (1975) and Andrews and Withey (1974), health concerns did load on a separate factor when more than two factors were extracted. Unfortunately with only one item dealing with health it is difficult to justify a dimension of "health or medical satisfaction." Further the factor did not meet the minimum eigenvalue criteria established in advance.

With respect to further findings of Rojek, et al.(1975), we were unable to identify a "service factor." In fact, all services with exception of health, i.e., schools, law enforcement, etc., loaded across factors. As a result these items were not included in the development of composite scales for the two primary dimensions of satisfaction identified above. Instead, the

scales were developed as a simple summation over the three variables that loaded cleanly on each factor. This procedure of eliminating low-loading or cross-loaded items in the construction of a scale results in the convergence of theta and alpha reliabilities. As such, the use of a simple, unweighted sum of the item scores does not sacrifice reliability.

Employing the above procedure, two separate scales were constructed. Both scales had theoretical and empirical ranges of 4 (lowest possible) to 13 (highest possible) satisfaction. The mean economic satisfaction score was 6.3 with a standard deviation of 2.0. Interpersonal satisfaction was characterized by a mean of 11.05 with a standard deviating 1.7. The two scores were correlated -.07. The reliability coefficients (alpha) for the two scales are .68 and .71 for interpersonal and economic satisfaction respectively.

With this information, it is possible to return to the central issue. Is satisfaction differentiated on the basis of residence? If so, does the differentiation persist in the face of controls?

Satisfaction and Place of Residence

The findings summarized in the analysis of variance section of Table 2 confirm the existence of a relationship between residence and economic satisfaction. The F value of 210 is statistically significant beyond the .001 level. The nature of the relationship can be seen by examining the mean satisfaction scores for each residence. The urban residents were most satisfied economically ($\bar{X}$ = 8.1). Both rural and rural-urban mix residents exhibited scores smaller than their urban counterparts. In short, both the rural and the mixed areas show less satisfaction with their economic situation than do urban residents. In fact, economic satisfaction decreases monotonically

from a high of 8.1 in urban areas to a low of 5.04 in rural areas.

Table 2 about here

The ubiquitous nature of the relationship between economic satisfaction and residence is evidenced by the various significant F ratios in Table 2. Additionally, the nature of the relationship is attested to by the b coefficients in Column 2 and the actual means in Column 3. Finally, the strength of the overall relationship is given by the multiple R of .64. The interpretation of the coefficient (or more correctly its square) is straightforward. Approximately 41 percent of the variation in economic satisfaction is accounted for by residence.

The dummy variable regression section of Table 2 reveals information of a slightly different nature. Specifically, the b of -3.06 indicates that overall, the satisfaction of rural residents differs from that of urban residents (the excluded category) by 3.06 units. In short, rural residents are less satisfied than urban residents. The corresponding F value of 402 indicates that a difference of that magnitude would be expected to occur by chance alone less than one time out of one thousand. The b coefficient of -1.35 for the rural-urban split category is interpretable in exactly the same way. Overall, the economic satisfaction of residents in the mixed area can be expected to differ by -1.35 units from the mean satisfaction of urban residents. Finally, the expression $b_1 - b_2$ denotes the difference in the predicted satisfaction level between the rural and the rural-urban split areas. Hence, the satisfaction of rural residents can be expected to differ from that of rural-urban mix residents by -1.71 units (-3.06 plus 1.35). In other words,

rural satisfaction levels differ from mixed levels approximately as much as mixed levels differ from urban levels. The nature of the differences support not only the idea of dichotomous rural-urban differences, but also the notion of a rural-urban continuum.

As noted in an earlier section, community satisfaction is not a unidimensional concept. The data in Table 2 supported the existence of rural-urban differences in economic satisfaction. Similarly, the data presented in Table 3 support the claim for differential interpersonal satisfaction by residence. The overall F value of 40.4 is again significant beyond the .001 level. However, the multiple R of .35 attests to the fact that the degree of association is not as close for interpersonal satisfaction as for economic satisfaction. Only 12 per cent of the variation in interpersonal satisfaction is explained by residence mode.

Table 3 about here

Turning next to an examination of the b values with regard to interpersonal satisfaction, it can be seen that overall, rural residents can be expected to differ by 1.33 units from the mean of the excluded category (urban). In other words, rural residents demonstrate higher levels of interpersonal satisfaction ($\bar{X}$ = 11.6) than urban residents ($\bar{X}$ = 10.3). Similarly, the b values of .41 for the rural-urban mix is significant. Hence, it is concluded that the level of interpersonal satisfaction for the mixed population does differ from the level of the urban population more than would be expected by chance. The difference between rural and mixed areas is .92 ($b_1 - b_2 = 1.33 - .41$). The coefficient indicates that the difference between rural and mixed is larger than that between urban and mixed. Once again, however, the relative positions of the means support

the notion of a rural-urban continuum of interpersonal satisfaction. In this instance, however, rural residents demonstrate the highest level of satisfaction ($\bar{X}$ = 11.6) and urban residents demonstrate the lowest level ($\bar{X}$ = 10.3). As with economic satisfaction, the mean interpersonal satisfaction level of the mixed population is between that for rural and the urban areas ($\bar{X}$ = 10.7).

One further piece of information is available by comparing the overall means of the two separate dimensions of satisfaction. The range on both scales was from 4 to 13. Hence, an overall mean for economic satisfaction of 6.3 can be compared to an overall mean of 11.04 for interpersonal satisfaction. The standard deviations are 2.0 and 1.7 for economic satisfaction and interpersonal satisfaction, respectively. The comparison points to an interesting finding. Regardless of residence, the level of interpersonal satisfaction is always considerably higher than the level of economic satisfaction. Further, the two dimensions of satisfaction seem to be virtually independent of each other. The zero order correlation relating economic satisfaction to interpersonal satisfaction was -.07. Thus, even though rural residents are relatively dissatisfied with their communities economically, they are, at the same time, relatively satisfied with their communities on an interpersonal level. The reverse is characteristic of urban residents.

The above discussion supports the existence of rural-urban differences on two dimensions of community satisfaction. The question of primary concern in this paper is, however, whether residential mode would maintain its impact when controlling for germane personal characteristics.

Colume 1 of Table 4 witnesses the joint impact of residence and personal characteristics (age, income, education, tenure in community, and family size) on levels of community satisfaction. Considered simultaneously, the complete

model accounted for 42 percent of the variation in economic satisfaction and approximately 15 percent of the variation in interpersonal satisfaction. The coefficients in Column 3 of Table 4 summarize the existent association between satisfaction and five potential control variables. The controls alone explained approximately 8 per cent of the variation in both dimensions of satisfaction. Given these relationships, the question of concern is: Does residence continue to differentiate levels of satisfaction when controlling for personal characteristics of the population? The strongest, i.e., most conservative, test of the query is obtained by employing a multiple-partial correlation model (Blalock, 1960). In this case, the block of five control variables is allowed to explain as much variance as it can. Subsequently, residence is allowed to explain any of the remaining variance not explained by the controls. As such, residence is only given an opportunity to explain variance over and above that explained by the block of controls. Column 4 of Table 4 summarizes the results of the control process. The entries in this column are squared multiple-partial correlation coefficients. The interpretation of the coefficients is straightforward. The first entry of (.370) indicates that residence explains 37 percent of the variation in economic satisfaction after the controls have been allowed to explain all they can. Put in slightly different terms, residence accounts for approximately 88 per cent of the total explained variance in economic satisfaction (Column 5).

Table 4 about here

The interpretation for interpersonal satisfaction is synonymous. The total model explained 15.3 per cent of the variation. Of that explained variation,

residence alone accounted for approximately 8 per cent. The 8 per cent represents approximately 62 per cent of the total explained variation.

The data just presented support the existence of a substantial net impact of residence on community satisfaction. Additional supporting data of a slightly different nature are presented in Table 5. Of primary interest are the relative magnitudes of the standardized partial regression coefficients (betas) and the difference between the beta's and the zero order correlation coefficients. The germane beta coefficients for economic satisfaction evidence the relatively large impact of residence (beta = -.77 and -.28 for rural and rural-urban areas, respectively) compared to personal charactertistics. The magnitude of these coefficients ranged from .00 for age and total family income to a maximum of .06 for education level. In no instance did coefficients other than those for residence obtain a magnitude that was statistically significant at the .05 level. In short, virtually no net impact of any one particular personal characteristic was found when controlling for residence and the remaining personal characteristics in the equation. A comparison of the beta to the relevant zero order correlation gives additional insight into net versus total impact. In the case of age, income and number of years in the community, the zero order correlations demonstrate a gross relationship with economic satisfaction. But, in every instance, the effect is reduced or eliminated by controlling for the remaining variables in the equation. The same is true for every personal characteristic included in the study. Conversely, a comparison of the beta coefficients and the zero order correlations relating residence categories to economic satisfaction indicates a very different situation. In both instances, the betas

are substantially larger than the zero order correlations. The change is from -.60 to -.77 for rural areas and +.13 to -.28 for rural-urban mix areas. In the latter case, the uncontrolled positive relationship is changed to a negative one when controls are employed. In other words, a control for personal characteristics increases rather than decreases the magnitude of the relationship between residence and economic satisfaction.

Table 5 about here

The controlled situation with regard to interpersonal satisfaction results in somewhat different conclusions. In this case, several of the beta coefficients do reach a statistically significant magnitude. The coefficients of .09 for education and .08 for family size are both significant at the .05 level. Additionally, the coefficients of .18 relating tenure in community to interpersonal satisfaction is significant at the .01 level. As was true for economic satisfaction, the two beta coefficients (.34 and .10) relating residence to interpersonal satisfaction are statistically significant. It is again interesting to note that the negative zero order relationship of -.11 between rural-urban area and interpersonal satisfaction is reversed (+.10) when controls are employed.

Although the ubiquitous nature of rural-urban differences in community satisfaction has been demonstrated, a capsule empirical summary is in order. To this issue comparison of mean community satisfaction in conjunction with residence alone and in conjunction with residence adjusting for controls is most apropos (Table 6). Adjusted means are slightly more divergent than unadjusted means in the case of economic satisfaction. In short, not only do

controls not eliminate residential differences in economic satisfaction, such differences are accentuated. For levels of interpersonal satisfaction, adjustment for controls does result in some narrowing of differences between means. Still, however, substantial differences remain. Thus in both instances, covariant effects on community satisfaction are negligible.

Table 6 about here

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, the data herein reported support the existence of differential community satisfaction on the basis of residence. Urban people tend to be more economically satisfied and rural people least economically satisfied. The satisfaction level of people from a rural-urban mix area falls between the two extremes. The relationship is maintained when controls for personal characteristics are employed. With regard to interpersonal satisfaction, the monotonic nature of the relationship is maintained, but the relative positions of rural and urban are reversed. Rural people tend to have the highest levels of interpersonal satisfaction and urban people the lowest levels. Again, the people from mixed areas fall between the two extremes. Controlling for five covariates does not alter the essential nature of the relationship. Hence, at least with regards to dimensions of community satisfaction, rural-urban differences appear not only real but relatively important.

The overall character of the present effort may be depicted schematically incorporating residence (dichotomized for the sake of simplicity) and both dimensions of satisfaction. Even tentative explanations of the results are, however, somewhat more perplexing. More simply, espousal of typical theoretical concepts to account for economic satisfaction tend to be less viable with

regard to interpersonal satisfaction. For example, division of labor normally associated with urban regions could be employed to suggest increased job opportunities in those regions and ultimately the basis for increase in economic satisfaction accompanying rural to urban comparison. At the same time, however, division of labor is typically associated with impersonality which would then suggest like decreases in interpersonal satisfaction. Given the levels of both satisfaction scores in Chart 1 such prediction would appear to be accurate for economic satisfaction but only minimally so for interpersonal satisfaction. In other words, how is it that the range of variation is so much larger for economic than interpersonal satisfaction? One possible explanation could be built upon an assumption that there exists a primacy of values such that the influence of residence operates on those which are more superficial. The dimensional analysis of the present investigation and that of Andrews and Withey (1974), suggests that the economic dimension is one such value space. Fischer (1972) asserts such to be true but provides a more sophisticated scheme of explanation.

Chart 1 about here

Specifically, Fischer (1972) develops a processual characterization of urbanism. If this conception is juxtaposed with that which views "rurality" as, at least in part, a behavioral trait (Bealer, 1966; Lowe and Peak, 1974), a more definitive characterization is possible. The behavior trait conceptualization focuses immediate attention on residential origin rather than present residence. At the same time "rurality" is asserted to be both an individual and structural variable. The character of the present findings

are interpretable if the conjunctive influencesof both present and original residence are considered. Both residential modes are seen as components of Fischer's (1972) characterization of subcultural intensification and cultural diffusion. The logic of the framework is presented below.

Given original and present residence, four combinations are possible (R_oR_p, R_oU_p, U_oR_p, and U_oU_p). Changes in values should thus center on those whose present residence differs from that of their origin. Fischer (1972) argues that such changes will be in accord with cultural diffusion and subcultural intensification. Assume the previous arguments regarding satisfaction and division of labor/impersonality. Given those relationships, expectations of satisfaction in terms of the four residential combinations with simple diffusion would generally follow the levels as depicted in Chart 2. Quite simply, values of present residential area would eventually be adopted irrespective of residential origin.

Chart 2 about here

Fischer (1972), however, argues that intensification tends to negate the diffusion process.[4] This is predicted on the assumptions that: (1) sub-groups are of sufficient size to develop subcultural traits; (2) which are in turn intensified by apparent contrasts with other subgroups with whom contact is unavoidable. In terms of the present effort it is not likely that subcultural traits will develop for U_oR_p due to limited size. Adoption of values through diffusion would thus be likely for U_oR_p residents but reduced for R_oU_p residents. Adding intensification to diffusion processes thus suggests satisfaction levels resulting from value changes to be as depicted in Chart 3.

Chart 3 about here

The final assumption made by Fischer (1972) is that of variations in the intensity of valued objects, i.e., some are more superficial, others are of greater depth. It has previously been noted that the interpersonal dimension is more central and pervasive than the economic dimension. From that observation, it would be expected that the degree of value change would be less on the interpersonal than on the economic dimension. The culmination with regard to satisfaction and residential types would thus follow the levels noted in Chart 4.

Chart 4 about here

The result of the above logical process may be worthwhile not only in terms of interpretation of the present findings but also for future concerns. For the present, it is apparent that such processes would tend to restrict the range of variation in interpersonal satisfaction if consideration is only upon present residence. The current findings conform to that characterization. In terms of future efforts, two points are readily apparent. First, "rurality" as a behavioral trait should assume much greater importance and be viewed in conjunction with structural measures. What of more long term implications? If the processes discussed above are shown to have merit, greater attention should be directed toward residence of origin in conjunction with present residence. More specifically, the interdependence between rural and urban areas espoused by Fuguitt (1963) should be examined closely in future attempts to clarify the social effects of residence.

Footnotes

2. The data employed in the present study were collected through the use of a structured interview schedule in the winter of 1972. Six hundred twenty-four respondents were randomly selected from five different counties in Utah. The procedure resulted in 595 usable observations. The five counties selected for study constitute three different locations along a hypothetical rural-urban continuum. A total of 294 usable responses were selected from three counties in southern Utah which were classified as having 100 percent of their population living in rural areas. In addition to the rural sample, 139 additional respondents were selected from an eastern Utah county whose residence structure in 1970 consisted of approximately 60 percent rural and 40 percent urban population. Finally, an additional 162 respondents were drawn from the Valley West area of Salt Lake County. The residence classification of Salt Lake County is urban.

3. It should be noted that when employing an oblique rotation procedure (Table 1) the loadings are virtually identical to the orthogonal solution. In fact, the two are sufficiently close to preclude the construction of an oblique factor structure that differs from the factor pattern.

4. Intensification is defined as the process by which groups previously external to residential areas develop stronger normative cohesion, beliefs and values.

Table 1

Principle Component Factor Matrix of Community Satisfaction Items

Variable	Unrotated Factors			Orthogonally Rotated		Oblique Pattern	
	Interpersonal Satisfaction	Economic Satisfaction	h^2	Interpersonal Satisfaction	Economic Satisfaction	Interpersonal Satisfaction	Economic Satisfaction
Family	.53	.46	.49	.70	-.01	.70	-.00
Health	-.26	.35	.19	.04	.44	.04	.44
Schools	.08	.50	.25	.39	.32	.39	.32
Friends	.57	.51	.58	.76	-.00	.76	.00
Religion	.43	.56	.50	.69	.13	.69	.13
Jobs	-.53	.48	.51	-.07	.71	-.07	.71
Income	-.52	.48	.50	-.07	.70	-.07	.70
Housing	-.59	.50	.59	-.11	.76	-.10	.76
Law	-.09	.54	.30	.29	.46	.30	.46
Outdoors	.73	.07	.55	.59	-.44	.59	-.44
Pollution	.75	.09	.58	.62	-.43	.62	-.43
% Total Variation	26.2	19.7	46.0				
% Common Variance	56.9	43.1					
Eigenvalues	2.89	2.17					

*The number of factors extracted was dictated by the eigenvalue 1 Rule. The orthogonal rotation was accomplished via a varimax procedure. The oblique rotation employed is the direct oblimin procedure used by SPSS.

TABLE 2

DUMMY VARIABLE REGRESSION OF ECONOMIC SATISFACTION ON RESIDENCE*

Residence	b_1'	$\bar{X}$ $(a + b_1')$	F	P
Rural	-3.06	5.04	402	< .001
Rural-Urban	-1.35	6.75	55	< .001
Urban		8.1		
Overall Mean		6.3		

Total Analysis of Variance

Source	ss	df	MS		P	R
Regression	1024.4	2	512.2			
				210	< .001	.64
Residual	1443.0	592	2.4			

*Residence is broken down into three categories, rural, urban, and rural-urban split. Employing a dummy variable regression model $Y = a + b_1D_1 + b_2D_2$, a = the mean ($\bar{X}$) of the excluded category (urban). b_1 and b_2 represent differences in economic satisfaction from the mean of the excluded category for respective categories of residence.

TABLE 3

DUMMY VARIABLE REGRESSION OF INTERPERSONAL SATISFACTION ON RESIDENCE

Residence	b_1'	$\bar{X}$ $(a + b_1')$	F	P
Rural	1.33	11.62	72.6	$<.001$
Rural-Urban	.41	10.70	5.0	$<.05$
Urban		10.30		
Overall Mean		11.04		

Total Analysis of Variance

Source	ss	df	MS	F	P	R
Regression	205.1	2	102.5			
				40.4	$<.001$	.35
Residual	1500.7	592	2.53			

TABLE 4

PERCENT OF VARIATION IN SATISFACTION EXPLAINED BY RESIDENCE AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

% Variance Explained by Residence and Personal Characteristics	% Variance Explained by Residence Alone	% Variance Explained by Personal Characteristics alone	% Variance Explained by Residence with Personal Characteristics Controlled	Ratio Column 4 To Column 1
		Economic Satisfaction		
41.9	41.5	07.8	37.0	.88.
		Interpersonal Satisfaction		
15.3	12.0	08.0	07.9	.52.

24

TABLE 5

REGRESSION OF SATISFACTION ON RESIDENCE AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS*

(Beta Coefficients, Probabilities of Beta, Zero Order Correlation)

Age	Total Family Income	Education	No. Years in Community	Total Number of Children	Rural	Rural-Urban
			Economic Satisfaction			
.00	.00	.06	.04	-.01	-.77	-.28
NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	.001	<.001
-.19	.16	.09	-.26	-.06	-.60	.13
Constant = 7.5						
F	60.6					
R	.65					
			Interpersonal Satisfaction			
-.07	.06	.09	.18	.08	.34	.10
NS	NS	<.05	<.001	<.05	<.001	.05
.08	.00	.06	.23	.11	.33	-.11
Constant = 9.1						
F	15.2					
R	.39					

*When employing dummy variables in a multiple regression equation, the form is $y = a + b_1D_1 + b_2D_2 + b_3X_1 + \ldots + b_iX_i$. Again "a" represents the intercept for the excluded category of the dummy variable (residence), adjusted for all other variables in the equation. The slope coefficients on the remaining dummies are interpretable as differences from that adjusted intercept.

TABLE 6

UNADJUSTED AND ADJUSTED MEANS FOR COMMUNITY SATISFACTION BY RESIDENCE*

	Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	Economic	Interpersonal	Economic	Interpersonal
Rural	5.04	11.62	5.01	11.54
Rural-Urban	6.75	10.70	6.76	10.77
Urban	8.10	10.30	8.14	10.40
Eta	(.64)	(35)	(.66)	(30)

*The means have been adjusted for the five covariates in the equation (age, income, education, community tenure, and family size) by means of analysis of covariance via SPSS.

Chart 1

	Residence:	
Satisfaction:	Rural	Urban
Economic	Low	High
Interpersonal	Very High	High

Chart 2

	Residential Types			
Satisfaction:	R_oR_p	R_oU_p	U_oR_p	U_oU_p
Economic	L	H	L	H
Interpersonal	H	L	H	L

Chart 3

	Residential Types			
Satisfaction:	R_oR_p	R_oU_p	U_oR_p	U_oU_p
Economic	L	M	L	H
Interpersonal	H	M	H	L

No intensification due to lack of sub-cultural development

Chart 4

	Residential Types			
Satisfaction:	R_oR_p	R_oU_p	U_oR_p	U_oU_p
Economic	L	M	L	H
Interpersonal	H	M+	M	L

Less change due to I>E in value

Appendix A

In order to get the information used in the Factor Analysis (Table 1), the subjects were asked the following question:

How would you rate your community or each of the following:

1. As a place to raise a family
2. As a place with adequate medical and health facilities
3. Quality of schools and other educational facilities
4. Friendliness of the people
5. Quality of religious life
6. Availability of good jobs for young people
7. Opportunity for earning a liveable income
8. Availability of suitable housing
9. Adequacy of law enforcement.
10. Access to outdoors and wide-open spaces
11. Absence of a polluted environment

The response categories were:

Excellent (1) Good (2) Fair (3) and Poor (4)

References

Andrews, F. M. and S. B. Withey

1974 "Assessing the quality of life as people experience it." Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Sociological Association. Montreal, Canada.

Armor, D. J.

1974 "Theta reliability and factor scaling." In Herbert L. Costner (ed.) Sociological Methodology 1973-1974. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bealer, R. C., F. K. Willits and W. Kuvlesky

1965a "The meaning of rurality in American society: Some implications of alternative definitions." Rural Sociology 30 (September):255-266.

Bealer, R. C.

1966b "A discussion of Leo F. Schore, 'The rural-urban variable: On urbanites' Perspective'." Rural Sociology 31 (June):144-48.

1975c "Theory and rural sociology." Rural Sociology 40 (Winter):455-477.

Blalock, Hubert M., Jr.

1960 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Dewey, R.

1960 "The rural-urban continuum: Real but relatively unimportant." American Journal of Sociology 66 (July):60-66.

Duncan, O. D.

1961 "Community size and the rural-urban continuum." In Jack P. Gibbs (ed.) Urban Research Methods. Princeton, N.J.: D. Von Nostrad.

Fuguitt, G. V.

1963 "The city and countryside." Rural Sociology 28 (September): 246-61.

Fischer, C. S.

1972 "Urbanism as a way of life, a review and agenda." Sociological Methods and Research 1 (November):187-242.

Heise, D. R.

1974 "Some issues in sociological measurement." In Herbert L. Costner (ed.) Sociological Methodology 1973-1974. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lowe, G. D. and C. W. Peak

1974 "Location and lifestyle: The comparative explanatory ability of urbanism and rurality." Rural Sociology 39 (Fall):392-420.

Miner, H.

1952 "The folk-urban continuum." American Sociological Review 17 (October).

Pahl, R. E.

1966 "The rural-urban continuum." Sociologia Ruralis 6 (3-4):299-321.

Rojek, D. G., F. Clemente, Gene F. Summers

1975 "Community satisfaction: A study of contentment with local services." Rural Sociology 40 (Summer):177-92.

Schnore, L. F.

1966. "The rural-urban variable: An urbanite's perspective." Rural Sociology 31 (June):131-43.

Sorokin, Pitrim and Carle C. Zimmerman

1929 Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Steward, C. T., Jr.

1958 "The urban-rural dichotomy: Concepts and uses." American Journal of Sociology 64 (September):152-58.

Willits, Fern K. and Robert C. Bealer

1963 "The utility of residence for differentiating social conservation in rural youth." Rural Sociology 28 (March):70-80.